

**City of Binghamton**  
**Commission on Architecture and Urban Design**  
**26 March 2013**  
**Minutes**

**APPROVED as corrected – 30 April 2013**

**Date:** 26 March 2013  
**Location:** Blueprint Binghamton Design Studio, 49 Court Street  
**Present:** Ruth Levy – Commissioner, Chair  
Mike Haas – Commissioner  
Peter Klosky – Commissioner  
Larry Borelli – Commissioner  
John Darrow – Commissioner  
H. Peter L’Orange – Historic Preservation Planner  
Joel Boyd – Economic Development  
Tom Costello – Building and Construction/Code Enforcement

Ms. Levy called the meeting to order at approximately 12:05 PM.

The minutes from the 26 February 2013 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Darrow made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted; it was seconded by Mr. Borelli. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-0.

**Items Heard:**

**83 Court Street – Façade:** Staff informed the Commission that the Applicant had asked that the review be delayed to the April meeting, so it had been pulled from the agenda.

**South Washington Street Bridge – Public Art project:** [Mr. Haas arrived at the beginning of this case.] Staff introduced the project as a public art project under development by Binghamton High School students. The students presented the art project to the Commission. Several Commission expressed concern about the idea of attaching an art project to the South Washington Street Bridge. There was some discussion of other potential locations. The students agreed to look at the other locations and come back to the Commission with more developed plans. The Commission expressed their support for the students’ efforts to bring more art into the City.

**201 State Street – Façade:** [Mr. Borelli departed during this case.] The Applicant presented this case. The Applicant proposes to redesign the façades of the building as part of the reoccupation of the building as a Tavern/Night-club on the first floor and residential on the upper floors. There was a detailed discussion of the proposed design. The Commission expressed concern that the proposed design was too modern for the age of the building. Specifically, the Commission was concerned about the lack of dimensionality on the building without any corner boards, friezes, window sills, or window trim. The Commission was also concerned that the design of the storefronts was not appropriate for the character of State Street; the Commission

recommended that the Applicant look to the building immediately to the north (205 State Street) for ideas in designing the storefront. There was also discussion of the arches above the top-floor windows. The Applicant indicated that they would just be filled with a panel. The Commission strongly recommended that the Applicant install fixed windows in the arch or at the very least install a carved, decorative panel in a fan pattern, as a simple plain panel would be inappropriate. The Commission requested that the Applicant take the Commission's comments, review the Historic Design Guidelines, and have a revised plan drawn up by their architect and come back to Commission at a future meeting. Mr. Darrow made a motion to table the case until revised drawings were presented; it was seconded by Mr. Haas. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-0; the case was TABLED.

**15 Hawley Street – Mechanical Enclosure:** Staff informed the Commission that the property owner had officially requested that the Commission table the case until the April meeting, so that he could attend. The Commission decided to still discuss the proposed plans, but agreed to withhold any decision. Various options for screening the mechanical facilities on the south side of the building. A general consensus was reached to have the Applicant design something which was primarily to keep patrons out of the area and provide some minimal visual screening, but that the construction of a complete enclosure was not necessary. The Applicant was agreeable to this. Mr. Darrow made a motion to table the case until the April meeting; it was seconded by Mr. Haas. The motion was carried 4-0-0; the case was TABLED.

#### **Other Business**

- Staff provided the Commission some information on proposed updates to the City's Zoning Code and other legislative efforts.

There was no further business.

Mr. Darrow made a motion to adjourn the meeting; it was seconded by Mr. Klosky. The motion carried 4-0-0. The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:25 PM.

The next meeting of the Commission on Architecture and Urban Design is scheduled for 30 April 2013.